



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*Fw*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,004	12/01/2003	Gerd Danner	13911-089001 / 2003P00266	5231
32864	7590	05/22/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			CHEN, TE Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/726,004

Applicant(s)

DANNER ET AL.

Examiner

Susan Y. Chen

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/18/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-20, are presented for examination.

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- 1) The use of acronyms, for examples: "SAP" (Page 6, Section 24), "XI" (page 7, Section 28), etc. should be clearly identified for its meanings.
- 2) The use of the trademarks such as "ActiveX" (Page 6, Section 24), "JDBC" (Page 6, Section 24), "SAP" (Page 6, Section 24) and "InfoCubes" (Page 10, Section 36) that is developed by "Microsoft", "Oracle", "SAP AG (Germany)" corporations and "Business Intelligence Solutions, Cognos" respectively, have been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1 and 9, are objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claims 1 (line13) and 9 (line 3), there is a mistyping error, the word "metal" should be changed to "meta". Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claims 1 and 15, the claim language use the terms “abstraction layer” (e.g., claim 1, line 7; claim 15, lines: 4, 6, 8& 10) and “configured to” (e.g., claim 1, line 8; claim 15, line 10) but the instant specification fails to provide actual steps to perform or limit these claims to a particular structure or layer/layers, thus, these terms render the claimed scope to be indistinct. See *In re Markman v. Westview Instruments*, 52 F.3d 967, 980, 34 USPQ2d 1321, 1330 (Fed. Cir.) (*en banc*), *off ‘d*, U.S., 116 Ct. 1384 (1996). For the purpose of expedite this examination, the examiner presumes that any one of prior art data processing tools encapsulate the claimed processing is configured or layered as claimed.

As to claims 2-14 and 16-20, these claims have the same defects as their base claims 1 and 15, therefore, they are rejected along the same rational.

Art Unit: 2161

Because the ambiguous nature of instant invention, the following art rejection is to the best that the examiner is able to ascertain.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this Section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under Section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in Section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. US 2003/0208460 issued to Srikant et al. (hereinafter referred as Srikant).

**Claim 1:**

Srikant discloses a system for operational reporting of multidimensional analysis of business data sources [e.g., the Online Analytical Processing (OLAP) application at P. 1, Sections: 0003-0010, Distributed Teradata Warehouse & Teradata Customer Analysis product at section 0035], the system comprising:  
one or more data sources providing OLTP data [e.g., the source metadata and the OLAP data store at P. 1, Sections: 0009, 0034-0035];

Art Unit: 2161

a business intelligence (BI) platform having a multidimensional database providing OLAP data [e.g., P. 1, Sections: 0003-0005, 0050-0052 & Fig. 4]; and

a data abstraction layer having a unified view module configured to integrate the OLTP data with the multidimensional database to produce a common meta model data set [e.g., the additional tools at P. 3, Section 0032-0034 & P. 4, Section 0041-0044]; and

a user interface (UI) tool set for creating a unified UI for displaying reports that are run on the multidimensional database and common meta model data set [e.g., the Graphical User Interface (GUI) at P. 3, Section: 0031].

Claim 2:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Srikant further discloses the system comprising a UI runtime module configured to display the unified UI [e.g., P. 3, Sections: 0035-0036].

Claim 3:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Srikant further discloses the system comprising a data acquisition module configured to acquire the OLTP data from the OLTP data source, and configured to provide the OLTP data to the multidimensional database or to the data abstraction layer [e.g., P.3, Sections: 0031, 0036-37].

Claim 4:

Art Unit: 2161

Except the features recited in claim 1, Srikant further discloses the BI platform is further configured to execute OLAP analysis on the multidimensional database [e.g., P. 2, Section: 0015-0016 & Fig. 7].

Claim 5:

Except the features recited in claim 4, Srikant further discloses the BI platform further includes a communication channel connected to a remote OLAP data source [e.g., the Internet at P. 6, Sections: 0062-0064].

Claim 6:

Except the features recited in claim 3, Srikant further discloses the data acquisition module further includes one or more resource adapters for connecting to the one or more data sources [e.g., Fig. 7 & P. 6, Sections: 0062-0064].

Claim 7:

Except the features recited in claim 3, Srikant further discloses the data acquisition module further includes one or more extraction programs configured to read data from the one or more data sources [e.g., the extract/link/load software of OLAP at P. 1, Section: 0005 & Fig. 8].

Claim 8:

Except the features recited in claim 3, Srikant further discloses the data acquisition module further includes an exchange infrastructure for message-

Art Unit: 2161

based exchange between the one or more data sources and the BI platform [e.g., the Teradata Customer Analysis Product at P. 3, Section: 0035].

Claim 9:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Srikant further discloses the system comprising a mapping tool for mapping a data model of the one or more data sources to a common meta model for use by the unified view module [e.g., P. 5, Section: 0059].

Claim 10:

Except the features recited in claim 9, Srikant further discloses the mapping is automatic [e.g., P. 2, Section: 0012].

Claim 11:

Except the features recited in claim 9, Srikant further discloses the mapping is manual [e.g., P. 6, Section: 0071].

Claim 12:

Except the features recited in claim 4, Srikant further discloses the BI platform further comprises a persistency memory for storing one or more tables representing the OLAP analysis [e.g., the unit 312, Fig. 3].

Claim 13:



Art Unit: 2161

Except the features recited in claim 1, Srikant further discloses the unified UI is generated by a web application [e.g., the Web GUI at P.3, Section: 0035 & P. 6, Section: 0064].

Claim 14:

Except the features recited in claim 1, Srikant further discloses the unified UI is generated by a desktop application [e.g., the Web GUI at P. 6, Section: 0064].

Claim 15:

Srikant discloses an architecture for integrating online transactional processing (OLTP) systems with online analytical processing (OLAP) system [e.g., the Online Analytical Processing (OLAP) application at P. 1, Sections: 0003-0010, Distributed Teradata Warehouse & Teradata Customer Analysis product at section 0035], the architecture comprising:

- a data access layer including one or more data access programs for accessing OLTP data [e.g., Fig. 3];

- a service layer including a business intelligence (BI) platform for generating OLAP data [e.g., P. 1, Sections: 0003-0005, 0050-0052 & Fig. 4];

- a data abstraction layer providing a common meta-model for OLTP data integrated with OLAP data [e.g., the additional tools at P. 3, Section 0032-0034 & P. 4, Section 0041-0044]; and

Art Unit: 2161

a user interface presentation layer configured to provide a user interface for displaying a report run on the integrated OLTP and OLAP data [e.g., the Graphical User Interface (GUI) at P. 3, Section: 0031].

Claim 16:

Except the features recited in claim 15, Srikant further discloses the common meta-model is organized into a unified business query view for display in the user interface [e.g., Fig. 2].

Claim 17:

Except the features recited in claim 15, Srikant further discloses the user interface presentation layer includes a design time module for generating the user interface [e.g., P. 3, Section: 0031].

Claim 18:

Except the features recited in claim 17, Srikant further discloses the user interface presentation layer includes a runtime module having an application for displaying the user interface [e.g., P. 3, Section: 0035].

Claim 19:

Except the features recited in claim 18, Srikant further discloses the application is a web application [e.g., P. 3, Section: 0035].

Art Unit: 2161

Claim 20:

Except the features recited in claim 18, Srikant further discloses the application is a desktop application [e.g., P. 3, Section: 0035].

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

1) Allor (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0207621) which discloses dynamic tree-node property page extensions that can be selectively enabled for a particular item of any type of data to users via a display.

2) Lucassen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,996,800) which discloses a Model-View-Controller (MVC) based multi-model authoring tool for developing applications via a unified, synchronized views of the information being presented across the various channels of devices.

3) Griffin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,847,973) which discloses a method to managing closely changing dimensions in a dimensional database.

4) Savage et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,604,110) which discloses automatic software code generation for Enterprise Data Management (EDM) System via metadata.

5) Borgrett (U.S. Patent No. 6,581,054) which discloses a method for creating a database.

Art Unit: 2161

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y. Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Susan Y Chen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2161

May 3, 2006

